

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Applicant further requests withdrawal of the finality of prosecution. Claims 1-6 and 22-26 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,234,389 to Valliani et al. (hereinafter, "Valliani"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 defines an assembly comprising "a device constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card, the device having an interface to communicate with a storage card and memory to store user data". The assembly further comprises "a removable storage card associated with a user that alternately enables access to the user data on the memory when interfaced with the device interface and disables access to the user data when removed from the device."

Valliani does not disclose the claimed assembly. Namely, Valliani does not disclose a device (which communicates with the removable storage card) that is "constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card." The term "form factor" refers to the physical size of a device as measured by outside dimensions. With regard to a disk drive, for example, the form factor is the overall diameter of the platters and case, such as 3.5" or 5.25". PCMCIA has its own specific dimensions that define the PCMCIA form factor. In claim 1, the device that communicates with the storage card is "constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card" so that the two-component assembly, when assembled with the storage card inserted into the

1 device, can be together inserted into a PCMCIA card reader. Valliani does not
2 show the assembly with a device of this form factor.

3 The Office contends that Valliani teaches a “PCMCIA-*compliant* device
4 200.” While module 200 may be PCMCIA *compliant*, it is most certainly not
5 “constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card” as claimed. Module 200 is sized
6 much larger than the PCMCIA form factor, and could not be inserted, for example,
7 into a PCMCIA slot in a portable computer.

8 For this reason alone, claim 1 is allowable over Valliani.

9 Secondly, claim 1 recites that the device has “memory to store user data.”
10 As illustrated in Fig. 1 of Valliani, module 200 (which the Office identifies as the
11 “device”) is not equipped with memory, let alone memory to store user data as
12 recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Office does not specifically address this
13 feature in the Action. Accordingly, for this additional reason, claim 1 is allowable
14 over Valliani.

15 For the reasons given above, Valliani does not disclose the assembly of
16 claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 1 be
17 withdrawn.

18 **Claims 2 and 5** depend from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this
19 dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together
20 with those of claim 1, define assemblies not described by Valliani.

21 For example, **claim 5** requires that “access to the user data in the memory
22 of the device is enabled upon authentication of a user-supplied passcode to the
23 passcode stored on the storage card.” Since Valliani provides no memory in
24 module 200 to store user data, Valliani provides no discussion of a security
25 protocol in which the separate storage card is used to control access to the user

1 data in the memory. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable over Valliani for this
2 additional reason.

3 **Independent claim 22** requires “a computer having a PCMCIA device
4 reader” and “a smart card secured memory assembly having a form factor of a
5 PCMCIA card to compatibly interface with the PCMCIA device reader in the
6 computer”. Claim 22 further requires that the smart card secured memory
7 assembly have “data memory to store user data and a removable smart card that
8 alternately enables access to the user data when present and disables access to the
9 user data when removed.”

10 Valliani is entirely silent as to the recited smart card secured memory
11 assembly. For the reasons given above with respect to claim 1, Valliani does not
12 describe an assembly “having a form factor of a PCMCIA card to compatibly
13 interface with the PCMCIA device reader in the computer”. Secondly, Valliani
14 does not disclose “data memory to store user data” and a “removable smart card
15 that alternately enables access to the user data when present and disables access to
16 the user data when removed.” Valliani is silent as to such a data memory.
17 Additionally, this latter feature is not addressed by the Office.

18 Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over Valliani. Application respectfully
19 requests withdrawal of the §102 rejection.

20 **Claim 24** depends from claim 22 and is allowable by virtue of this
21 dependency. Additionally, this claim recites features that, when taken together
22 with those of claim 22, define computer systems not described by Valliani.
23 Additionally, claim 24 is also allowable for similar reasons given above with
24 respect to claim 5.
25

1 **35 U.S.C. §103**

2 **Claims 3, 4, and 23**

3 Claims 3, 4, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being
4 unpatentable over Valliani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,701,884 to Dedrick
5 (hereinafter, “Dedrick”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

6 **Claims 3 and 4** depend from claim 1 and **claim 23** depends from claim 22.
7 Hence, these claims recite the two-component assembly that is constructed in a
8 “form factor of a PCMCIA card.” Valliani does not teach or suggest this feature.
9 As noted above, Valliani’s module 200 is not sized in the PCMCIA form factor.
10 Furthermore, the Office already admits that Dedrick does not teach the two-
11 component assembly that is constructed in a form factor of a PCMCIA card, as
12 evidenced by the remarks on page 5, item 5, of the Action.

13 Accordingly, Dedrick adds nothing to the teachings of Valliani with regard
14 to the claimed assembly found in claims 1 and 22. Applicant respectfully requests
15 that the §103 rejection of claims 3, 4, and 23 be withdrawn.

16 **Claims 6, 25, and 26**

17 Claims 6, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being
18 unpatentable over Valliani in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,623,637 to Jones et al.
19 (hereinafter, “Jones”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

20 **Claim 6** depends from claim 1 and **claims 25 and 26** depend from claim
21 22. Hence, these claims recite the two-component assembly that is constructed in
22 a “form factor of a PCMCIA card.” Valliani does not teach or suggest this feature.
23 Jones likewise fails in this regard. Accordingly, the combination of Valliani and
24 Jones fails to teach or suggest the features of claims 6, 25, and 26. Applicant
25 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.


1
2 **Conclusion**

3 All pending claims 1-6 and 22-26 are in condition for allowance. Applicant
4 respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject
5 application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the
6 Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent
7 Action.

8
9 Respectfully submitted,

10
11 Dated: June 26, 2002

12 By: _____

13 
14 Lewis C. Lee
15 Reg. No. 34,656
16 (509) 324-9256 ext. 211
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25